

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addease COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO Box 1430 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.webjo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,112	09/20/2006	Janice L. Jones	US040138US	1873
²⁸¹⁵⁹ , 7559 PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001			EXAMINER	
			BOSQUES, EDELMIRA	
Briarcliff Man	or, NY 10510-8001		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3767	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/27/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Application No. Applicant(s) JONES ET AL. 10/599,112 Office Action Summary Examiner Art Unit EDELMIRA BOSQUES 3767 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3T CFR 1.38(a), after SIX (6) MONTHS from the making date of this communication, or with a first SIX (6) MONTHS from the making date of the communication, or with a first SIX (6) MONTHS from the making date of the communication, or with the set of the six of the	OF THIS COMMUNICATION. In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed ply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication, se the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status	
Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 Septe</u> 2a This action is FINAL . 2b This action is FINAL . 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance closed in accordance with the practice under Exp	ion is non-final. except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
Disposition of Claims	
4) Claim(s) 1-18,23 and 24 is/are pending in the appl 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn ff 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) 1-18 and 23 are subject to restriction and.	rom consideration.
Application Papers	
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepte Applicant may not request that any objection to the draw Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is	ving(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign pric a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents ha 2. Certified copies of the priority documents ha 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority of application from the International Bureau (Pt * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the	ave been received. In the been received in Application No Indication No In this National Stage CT Rule 17.2(a)).
Attachment(s)	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date

3)	
	Information 5

4) 🗆	Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date.
5)	Notice of Informal Patent Application

Art Unit: 3767

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 1-4 and 5-10, drawn to an electrode for attachment.

Group II, claim(s) 11-18, drawn to a defibrillation apparatus.

Group III, claim(s) 23-24, drawn to a defibrillation apparatus having first, second and third defibrillation apparatus.

The groups of inventions listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

Inventions I and II-III are directed to related to an electrode for attachment having a conductive element and an electrode for attachment having a first and second conductive elements, a defibrillation apparatus and defibrillation apparatus having first, second and third defibrillation apparatus. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap

Art Unit: 3767

in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have a different a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect, the electrode of Group I requires an electrode attachment having a conductive element and requires energy application to the conductive element, whereas the invention of Group II requires a defibrillation apparatus having a power supply and a control circuit that the invention of Group I does not require; the invention of Group III requires a base unit including a power supply and a control circuit for selectively connecting the power supply to a first, second and third electrode, that the invention of Group I does not require.

Inventions II and III are directed to related a defibrillation apparatus and defibrillation apparatus having first, second and third defibrillation apparatus. The related inventions are distinct if: (1) the inventions as claimed are either not capable of use together or can have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect; (2) the inventions do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive; and (3) the inventions as claimed are not obvious variants. See MPEP § 806.05(j). In the instant case, the inventions as claimed have a materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. For instance the invention of Group II requires a defibrillation apparatus having a power supply and a control circuit connected to the power supply that the invention of Group III does not require; the invention of Group III requires a base unit including a power supply and a control circuit for selectively connecting the

Art Unit: 3767

power supply to a first, second and third electrode, that the invention of Group II does not require.

Furthermore, the inventions as claimed do not encompass overlapping subject matter and there is nothing of record to show them to be obvious variants.

A telephone call was made to Brinton Yorks on May 21, 2010 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse. Traversal must be presented at the time of election in order to be considered timely. Failure to timely traverse the requirement will result in the loss of right to petition under 37 CFR 1.144. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which of these claims are readable on the elected invention or species.

Art Unit: 3767

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions have unity of invention (37 CFR 1.475(a)), applicant must provide reasons in support thereof. Applicant may submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. Where such evidence or admission is provided by applicant, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

All claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the

Art Unit: 3767

requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Fallure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to EDELMIRA BOSQUES whose telephone number is (571)270-5614. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri (10:00am-4:00pm) every other Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin C. Sirmons can be reached on (571)-272-4965. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Application/Control Number: 10/599,112 Page 7

Art Unit: 3767

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/EDELMIRA BOSQUES/ Examiner, Art Unit 3767 /Melba Bumgarner/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3767